No 8.

the tackiman's preference; but the comprifer being feafed before the tack was clad with natural possession and decreets, the compriser was preferred; and also because he alleged, that the common author, from whom he comprised, remained in real possession of the lands himself, to the time of his sasine, which was admitted to his probation; albeit the tacksman alleged, that the summons, whereupon the decreet followed, was executed before the compriser's sasine; and that he had been in natural possession, before the sasine, of the mails and duties; like-as before the same, the possession of the lands being tacksmen to his author, they took new subtacks of him, and acknowledged his right, and paid to him their tack-duties; which was all repelled, as is above written.

Act. Nicolfon.

Alt. Cunninghame.

Clerk, Scot. Durie, p. 307.

1629. July 10. L. of Clackmannan against L. Barrounie.

In a reduction of a comprising, because the bond containing the sum, for which the comprising was deduced, was heritable and not made moveable; the tenor of which bond was, that the debtor, for the faid fum, was obliged to give his creditor infeftment in his land redeemable; and containing a back-tack yearly, for payment of victual, for the farm of the land; and also bearing, 'The debtor to be obliged, notwithstanding of the heritable disposition of the lands redeem-'able, to pay the furn, at the term, therein-contained; and in case of failzie, a " penalty;" this was the tenor thereof, and bore not, that the fum should be paid, either upon charge, or requisition to be made therefor, at the term of payment therein expressed, or at any other term, when the creditor should seek the same; but only fimply, that the debtor should pay it at that one term, specially expressed in the bond; after which term, diverse years, the money lying over unpaid, the party creditor receiving payment of the duties of the lands, or annualrent of the money, and thereafter comprising the land, for not payment of the principal fum and penalty, the purfuer defired the fame to be reduced; because. after the term of payment contained in the bond, he had received payment of his annualrent, and so had taken him to his heritable security of the land: And there was no clause whereby he might seek the sum at any other term; and so it was not compriseable; and the rather, there never being a charge used by the creditor against the debtor, before the comprising.—The Lords sustained the comprising, and affoilzied from the reason of reduction; for the Lords found, that albeit the bond did not oblige the party to pay the fum, at any term after that term expressed in the bond; yet that was tacitly comprehended therein, otherwise the debtor could not have been holden to pay the sum, if it had not been precifely fought, but had lain over that special term; which were, in justice, hard; and found there needed no charge, feeing the bond required not the fame; neither did the receipt of the annual, thereafter, prejudge the comprising; the

No 9. A bond, in which no charge nor requisition is ftipulated, found comprifeable, although no charge given.

No 9. fame being only deduced, for the principal and penalty; and which penalty extended not to fo many annuals, as the creditor wanted unpaid to him.

Act. Advocatus and Mowat.

Alt. Nicolfon, Burnet and Nairn.

Clerk, Hay.

Durie, p. 460.

1665. December 2.

M'Culloch against CRAIG.

No 10. A comprising found null, fubscribed only by the clerk, and not by the mesterner who was judge.

In a pursuit, at the instance of Sir Hugh M'Culloch against Mr John Craig, as representing his father, Mr Robert Craig, by progress; which Mr Robert, was debtor by bend to Patrick Wood, and which bend was comprised; the right whereof, came in the person of the said Hugh M'Culloch; whereupon he pursued the said Mr John:—There being nothing produced, but a comprising, subscribed by James Allan, who was clerk to the comprising, and not by the messenger who was judge; the Lords would find no process thereon.

Fol. Dic. v. 1. p. 5. Newbyth MS. p. 42.

1670. July 21.

LADY LUCY HAMILTON against the CREDITORS of MONCASTLE.

No 11. A warrant, upon a bill to lead a comprifing at another head burgh, than that of the fhire where the lands lay, was found null, fince it was not at Edinburgh, which is communis patria.

In the reduction, at Lady Lucy's instance, against the Creditors of Moncastle, it being alleged for Pitroan, one of the trustees, that he himself being a creditor, and inferted in the disposition ab initio, the same could not be taken away, but fcripto vel juramento.—It was replied, That he ought to condefcend and instruct in quantum he was creditor; specially, he being Moncastle's brother-in-law, and so a confident person.—The Lords did ordain him to condescend and instruct, otherwise they declared they would reduce his right as simulate. -2de, The defenders offered to purge the pursuer's comprising, she assigning them thereto.—To this it was replied, That the reversion of the comprising being expired, and the right thereby become irredeemable, she was not obliged to affign: but declared that the was content to discharge the comprising upon payment.— THE LORDS found the offer to discharge the comprising sufficient, and that she was not obliged to affign.—3tio, It was alleged for Kelburn, who was likewise compriser, That his right could not be reduced upon these libelled reasons: That the lands were denounced at the head burgh of the regality; and that the comprifing was led in Glasgow, which is not the head burgh of the shire; because, albeit regalities were suppressed at that time by the usurpers; yet quoad doing of legal diligence at the head burghs of regalities, there was no discharge thereof in their act and proclamation. And as to the fecond, the comprising was led at Glafgow, upon a special warrant from the English judges.

It was replied to the first, That by act and proclamation of the usurpers, all jurisdictions of Lords of regalities were discharged and suppressed; and these